

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Judith A. Parkel, et al.,	)	C.A. No. 4:07-3009-TLW-TER
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	ORDER
	)	
The State of South Carolina, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

The Plaintiffs brought this *pro se* civil action against the Defendants under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On August 7, 2008, the Plaintiffs moved for a default judgment as to certain defendants. The Defendants responded on August 25, 2008.

This matter is now before the undersigned for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed January 21, 2009, by United States Magistrate Judge Tom Rogers, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). In his Report, Magistrate Judge Rogers recommends that the Plaintiffs’ motion be denied. Plaintiffs has not objected to the Report.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4<sup>th</sup>

Cir. 1983).

In light of this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed the Report and has concluded that the Report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 206), and Plaintiff's motion is dismissed. (Doc. # 159).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

S/ Terry L. Wooten  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**TERRY L. WOOTEN**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

February 18, 2009  
Florence, South Carolina